

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 2, 2010. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated March 2, 2010.

Claims 1, 4, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloomfield et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,412,776) in view of Bonura et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,670,970).

Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 10, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloomfield et al., in view of Bonura et al., and further view of Leavitt, (U.S. Patent No. 6,918,091).

Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Office Action, on pages 6-7, states:

While Bloomfield does not specifically show the above limitations, Bloomfield does show a window switching apparatus. In the same field of invention, Bonura teaches displaying a window after a predetermined time has elapsed. Bonura further teaches that the user may set the predetermined time to any desired value in column 6, lines 13-29 and column 5, lines 53-61. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the window switching apparatus of Bloomfield to incorporate displaying . . . as taught by Bonura

However, Bloomfield , at column 8, lines 20-28, discloses:

Fig. 5 illustrates how invocation of an action on a single window from a window list 106 is presented to a user. A cursor 107 is moved to the area of the title

of the window and the entry is selected. As illustrated, cursor 107 has been moved to the area of title 114 which has now been highlighted to indicate selection. A pop up menu 116 of possible actions is then displayed for entry 114. An action can then be selected by moving cursor 107 to the desired action and selecting the action.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Bloomfield et al. fails to disclose the feature “the activation processing unit . . . making a window active, which corresponds to a title emphatically displayed” as recited in Claims 1 and 11.

On the other hand, Bonura et al. merely teaches displaying a window after a predetermined time has elapsed. That is, Bonura et al. fails to disclose the feature “said activation processing unit . . . making a window active, which corresponds to a title emphatically displayed when a predetermined time after another window was made active last time has elapsed” as recited in present Claims 1 and 11.

Thus, Bloomfield et al. and Bonura et al. fail to disclose or suggest making a window active which corresponds to a title emphatically displayed in the title list.

On the other hand, Claims 1 and 11 recite the feature “said activation processing unit . . . making a window active, which corresponds to a title emphatically displayed.”

In addition, since it is difficult to make a window corresponding to a title emphatically displayed active in succession when titles displayed as the title list are scrolled, Claim 1 or 11 recites the features “making a window active . . . when a predetermined time after another window was made active last time has elapsed” and “not making a window active, which corresponds to a title emphatically displayed to be switched in succession while the title displayed as said title list are

scrolled until said predetermined time has elapsed.” For example, see page 30, line 7 to page 31, line 24 of the specification of the present application.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that neither Bloomfield et al. nor Bonura et al. teaches or suggests the features as recited in Claims 1 and 11.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not reach the features of Claims 1 and 11 without hindsight and considerable reconstruction of Bloomfield et al. and Bonura et al. Rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness (MPEP 2141).

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 11 patentably distinguish over Bloomfield et al. and Bonura et al., and should be allowed. Also, Claims 4, 7, 10, 14, 17, and 20 each depend from Claim 1 or 11, directly or indirectly, and should be allowed.


If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants’ undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/634,843**
Response filed May 12, 2010
Reply to OA dated March 2, 2010

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP



James N. Baker
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,899

JNB/kn

Atty. Docket No. **030888**
Suite 400
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE